

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

JANET WATSON and WILLIAM WATSON,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	
	:	
v.	:	NO. 10-6731
	:	
HAVERFORD TOWNSHIP POLICE DEPARTMENT, THE TOWNSHIP OF HAVERFORD, CARMEN D. PETTINE, HARVEY PIKE, STEVEN GILL, and JOHN PILI,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 24<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2012, upon consideration of (1) Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Count I of the Complaint Against Officers Pike and Gill (Docket No. 26) and the Response of Defendants Haverford Township Police Department, the Township of Haverford, Harvey Pike, and Steven Gill (collectively "the Haverford Defendants") (Docket No. 30); and (2) the Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Docket No. 25), Plaintiffs' Response (Docket No. 31), the Haverford Defendants' Reply Brief (Docket No. 32), and Plaintiffs' Sur-Reply Brief (Docket No. 34), it is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1. Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Count I of the Complaint is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of Plaintiffs and against Defendants Officer Harvey Pike and Officer Steven Gill on Count I of the Amended Complaint.
2. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is **GRANTED IN PART and DENIED IN PART** as follows:
  - a. With respect to the John Doe Defendants, the Haverford Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of the John Doe Defendants on all claims and against Plaintiffs.

- b. With respect to Defendant Haverford Township Police Department, the Haverford Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of Defendant Haverford Township Police Department on all claims and against Plaintiffs.
- c. With respect to Defendant Township of Haverford, the Haverford Defendants' Motion is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of Defendant Township of Haverford on all claims.
- d. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' § 1983 claims of unlawful arrest and excessive force against Officers Pike and Gill is **DENIED**.
- e. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' § 1985 claim is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of the Haverford Defendants and against Plaintiffs on the § 1985 claim.
- f. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' state law claims of assault and battery is **DENIED**.
- g. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' state law claims of false arrest and false imprisonment is **DENIED**.
- h. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' state law claim of intentional infliction of emotional distress is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of the Haverford Defendants and against Plaintiffs on the intentional infliction of emotional distress claim.
- i. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' state law claim of negligence is **GRANTED. JUDGMENT IS ENTERED** in favor of the Haverford Defendants and against Plaintiffs on the negligence claim.
- j. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' state law claim of loss of consortium is **DENIED**.
- k. The Haverford Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' claim for punitive damages is **DENIED**.

It is so **ORDERED**.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Ronald L. Buckwalter  
RONALD L. BUCKWALTER, S.J.